

adequately pressed President Biden for answers to these very legitimate questions; for example, No. 1: Why did Joe Biden meet with Devon Archer at the White House on April 16, 2014? What did they discuss? Did they discuss anything related to Ukraine, Hunter Biden, or Burisma?

No. 2, was Joe Biden aware that Devon Archer joined the board of Burisma 6 days after that meeting, 1 day after he visited Ukraine?

No. 3, does Joe Biden believe Burisma and its owner are corrupt?

No. 4, when did Joe Biden first become aware that Hunter Biden also joined the board of Burisma?

No. 5, when did Joe Biden first become aware of how much money Hunter Biden was being compensated by Burisma? Senator GRASSLEY and my report showed it was close to \$4 million.

No. 6, what does Joe Biden know about Hunter or James Biden's dealings with China?

No. 7, what does Joe Biden know about financial benefits his brother and sister-in-law have obtained because of their relationships to him?

Investigative reporter John Solomon has added a few more questions to my list, including: No. 1, what, if anything, did Joe Biden know about his son's dealings with Russian oligarch Yelena Baturina?

No. 2, a 2017 series of memos referred to a Chinese business deal that involved Hunter Biden and included a 10-percent equity for the "big guy." What did Joe Biden know about this specific deal, and who was the "big guy"?

No. 3, emails on Hunter Biden's laptop, now in the possession of the FBI, refer to shared accounts or bills between Joe Biden and Hunter. Did Hunter ever give Joe Biden any money, gift, or financial benefit from Hunter's business dealings?

After a long-overdue analysis, the New York Times and the Washington Post have finally admitted that records from Hunter's laptop are authentic, which means—although they will never admit this—that Senator GRASSLEY and I were right, and they were wrong.

It is interesting to read how limited and muted their mea culpas are. My guess is that they learned a lot from their coverage of Nixon's Watergate scandal coverup. They learned that when you have been caught in a cover-up—and that is what has happened here—you try to limit the damage by telling a little bit of the truth. In the intelligence world, this strategy is called a "limited hangout." The Watergate coconspirators called it a "modified limited hangout."

Regardless of what you call it, what the New York Times and the Washington Post are doing is not telling the whole truth. I doubt they ever will. But just in case they decide to pursue the truth with a little bit more rigor, they can use the above list of relevant questions as a good starting point for what they should be asking President Biden.

For our part, Senator GRASSLEY and I will continue to ask tough questions, review more information and records, and transparently provide that information to the American public. We intend to pursue and uncover the truth.

I will now turn the floor back over to Senator GRASSLEY for his closing remarks.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank Senator JOHNSON. I will just quickly say that the journalists in this town have an obligation to investigate. They have an obligation to uncover the facts and the evidence. They have failed time and again.

What has been reported recently is simply the tip of the iceberg. The question now is: Instead of accusing us of peddling Russian disinformation, will the media actually engage in true investigative journalism? Will the media act with intellectual honesty, or will the media continue to cover all this up for the Biden administration?

Now, Congress has a constitutional responsibility to engage in oversight of the executive branch. The Biden administration has been totally unresponsive to our oversight requests; specifically, requests that relate to the Biden criminal case.

Is Nicholas McQuaid recused from the Hunter Biden case? No answer from the Department. Does the Department possess FISA information on Patrick Ho, Hunter Biden's associate? The Department told a Federal court they do. They told me and Senator JOHNSON that they aren't sure. Can you imagine that?

When Hunter Biden communicated with Patrick Ho, were his communications captured by our intelligence community? Is the Biden administration intentionally withholding this material from Congress out of fear of what we will find?

In light of the Biden administration's total failure to respond to our questions, these are legitimate questions to ask. The Biden Justice Department's actions have cast a cloud over the case. The American people are rightly skeptical of the impact it may have on it.

Transparency brings accountability. This week, Senator JOHNSON and I have done what we can to bring transparency to our oversight work for the American people. We will continue to do so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come here with real pleasure, pride, excitement, joy, and real exuberance not often felt on the floor of the U.S. Senate because we are going to be making

history this week. As confident as I am of anything ever in the U.S. Senate happening, this week we will confirm Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Let me, first of all, thank President Biden for nominating her. His wisdom and courage are one of the reasons that she is before us as a nominee in this historic vote. And to all my fellow Members of the Judiciary Committee, we have labored a long time, through many hours, and I particularly thank Senator DURBIN for his leadership.

Now, "historic" is a word that is often overused, even in this Chamber, where a lot of history is made, but Judge Jackson's nomination truly merits that word. It is a joyous, exciting moment for all Americans because Justice Jackson will make the U.S. Supreme Court look more like America and, hopefully, think more like America at a time when Black women and people with diverse backgrounds, races, religions have broken many barriers.

Her confirmation will be a giant leap into the present. She stands on the shoulders of many who have come before her, as she recognized so explicitly in our hearing. One of them is Constance Baker Motley, a daughter of New Haven, CT, the first Black woman to argue before the U.S. Supreme Court and the first Black woman to be appointed as a judge on the U.S. district court.

Now, she was also instrumental in the well-known and profoundly significant case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, argued by Thurgood Marshall, and she won every one of the cases that she argued before the U.S. Supreme Court. I have argued four; she argued ten. Her record surpasses almost any of the litigators who have become judges.

Not only will she be the first Black woman on the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Jackson will be the first public defender. What does that mean? She has represented people who couldn't afford a lawyer. There is nobody on this Court who has represented people who couldn't afford a lawyer as a full-time profession or public defender. She has more experience as a trial lawyer and a trial judge combined than anybody on the U.S. Supreme Court now and probably over the last century.

She has academic credentials that are superlative. She has written and taught and counseled in ways that give her insights into the real-life meaning of the law and its real impact on people.

It has also given her an emotional intelligence. There is no question that she is qualified by virtue of intellect and intelligence. Book smart—there is no question that she is book smart, but she is also people smart. She understands, as Justice Breyer has, as well, that all of these abstruse legalisms, all of the abstract concepts in law, all the technical distinctions, all of the verbiage—they have a real-life impact when they are words in a statute, when

they are words in a legal opinion, when they are words from the mouths of judges or Justices—Federal or State. She understands that real-life impact, which gives her more than intellect. It gives her emotional intelligence.

I will say that I have talked to Judge Jackson about her feelings, her instincts at critical decision points as a judge. In sentencing, when she knew that another person's life was in her hands, metaphorically, and when another person's future was within her decision-making power, she has looked at sentencing decisions with all of the data points, all of the emotional intelligence, all of the judgment that she has advanced so movingly in her conversations with us, as well as her appearance before our committee.

She has that capacity for empathy that very few people have. A lot of people can go to school and can graduate with honors. They can be book smart, but she understands the impact of law on real lives and real people. It is those people whose lives are touched by the justice system. Whether they are victims or criminal defendants or litigants dealing with personal or professional conflict, their stories shone through her conversations with us and her testimony before our committee and her enthusiasm for the law, because judges are the face and voice of justice, and representation matters.

It matters for the legitimacy and credibility of our judicial system that our judges look like America, that somebody coming into a courtroom sees that that Justice has that face and voice that can relate to them.

Judge Jackson will bring to the U.S. Supreme Court all those immensely important qualities and, certainly, she will bring a lot of patience and perseverance. She has shown those qualities, but also grace and dignity, in the way that she responded to some of the abusive, demanding questions that she was asked during our hearing. She has weathered that storm with extraordinary distinction and diligence. When some of our colleagues went low, she went high, to paraphrase Michelle Obama.

When she was attacked for not claiming a "judicial philosophy," she pointed to the decisions and opinions and disclaimed a judicial philosophy, just as Chief Justice Roberts did when he was asked in his hearing about judicial philosophy and he said he had no "overarching judicial philosophy" and, instead, described his role as "call[ing] balls and strikes."

She said she knew her lane. She does, indeed, know her lane. She maybe didn't use the same terminology, but it is that objectivity and impartiality that Chief Justice Roberts described that will also guide her as a matter of principle and philosophy.

There were other criticisms of Judge Jackson, and one conservative commentator described these attacks as "meritless to the point of demagoguery." He was right. The concocted

outrage, the straw man, the old grievances, the ancient complaints about past hearings and the treatment of nominees, all will fade and be forgotten because what shone through her performance was her integrity, her depth and warmth, her grace and dignity.

Far from being soft on crime, very movingly, she described what it is like to have a family member who walks a beat because her brother is a cop and her uncle, a chief of police. She described the worries, concerns, even fear that family members have when their relatives are police—when their brother or uncle puts himself in harm's way. And that is probably the reason she has been endorsed by the largest rank-and-file enforcement organization in the country, the Fraternal Order of Police, as well as the International Association of Chiefs of Police, high-ranking officials from the Department of Justice, and nearly 100 former assistant U.S. attorneys, many of whom observed her work as a judge firsthand.

Some may have tried to smear her, but they failed abysmally, fortunately. She had a reversal rate of about 2 percent, well below the rate that the average district judge has in the DC Circuit. And she has been endorsed, as well, by former colleagues who were appointed by Republican judges—well-respected conservative judges who disagreed with her in the outcome of cases but who deeply respected the way she called those balls and strikes in the best and truest sense of the term.

And she has shown her independence. She has ruled for and against the Trump administration. She has ruled for and against labor and collective bargaining, for and against qualified immunity, for and against class certification, because her philosophy and her "methodology," to use her word, is to follow the facts and the law, and that is what she will do as a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Let me just finish, finally, with, maybe, what I think is going to be most important about Justice Jackson.

She is a unifier and a consensus builder. She is someone who can build bridges among colleagues and even adversaries. She has been confirmed on a bipartisan basis three times already by the Senate because she is a bridge builder, and the Court needs a bridge builder now more than ever. It has been politicized and polarized in a way that undermines respect and trust in the American people. Partly, it is the self-inflicted wounds of the Court, which have been dominated in many decisions by a far-right coalition that have made it look political, and that perception is deeply important because the Court's trust and respect depend on the public perceiving it to be above politics.

So the Court has inflicted wounds on itself, but so have the Congress and the political branch inflicted wounds on the Court by dragging it through a seemingly political process and making nominations and appointments seem to

be the result of partisan politics, so that it may be perceived as just another political branch.

I said at the very start that I have reverence for the Court and deep respect for it as an institution. It has no armies or police. It has no power of the purse. Its authority depends on its credibility.

My hope is that Judge Jackson as Justice Jackson will help elevate it in a way that it needs now more than ever. I asked her about a code of ethics for the U.S. Supreme Court, and she said she would talk to her colleagues about it. I feel she has an understanding of the need now for the Court to adopt a code of ethics.

It is the only judicial body that lacks a code of ethics. It has none. Unlike the appellate courts, the district courts, the U.S. magistrate, the court of claims—all of the minor judicial bodies in the United States—it has no code of ethics because it has resisted a code of ethics. Its credibility now depends on its having a code of ethics.

Recent events have severely imperiled credibility and trust, and that peril will grow as more becomes known about some of these events. But the Court can help itself by supporting a code of ethics rather than resisting it.

Judge Jackson's commitment to talk to her colleagues about it is a very welcome and important step. She said it in response to a question that I asked. I was the only member of the committee to ask about a code of ethics—surprisingly, to me. But restoring credibility and trust will be important to our Nation. Her service will help restore and inspire confidence. Her presence and active participation on the Court will help that task of reinvigorating credibility and trust.

Her confirmation will be, indeed, a giant leap forward into the present and the future. It will inspire lots of young girls, lots of young women, lots of Black women, lots of Americans to believe in the American dream and to believe and see the law in different ways. That is what one of the young girls who wrote to Judge Jackson said in her letter, indeed, that she would look at the law in a different way.

We will look at the law in a different way, and we will look at the Court in a different way because the Court will look and hopefully think more like America.

I am looking forward to that vote. I will never cast a vote in this body that I am more proud and excited to do.

I thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and hopefully there will be more on the other side of the aisle joining us for this historic achievement for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, in the last few weeks, we have heard a lot about and from Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson.

I would like to start off by congratulating Judge Jackson and her family on her nomination. I had a wonderful meeting with the judge last week. She is a highly qualified attorney. I would also like to congratulate her for making it through the Senate Judiciary Committee. The hearing process can be grueling, but it is extremely important. Judge Jackson demonstrated grace under pressure. However, I have concerns about Judge Jackson's nomination and will not be supporting her confirmation to the Supreme Court.

Perhaps my greatest issue with Judge Jackson is her lack of adherence to a judicial philosophy. I have been very clear with each Supreme Court nominee since I took office that I am looking to support a nominee who prescribes to originalism. Judge Jackson explained during the Senate Judiciary hearing that she abides by a judicial "methodology" instead of a philosophy. This means, according to her, that she begins at a neutral position to understand the facts and to interpret the law, receives all the appropriate inputs, and then interprets the law.

While I would hope that all judges, no matter which court they sit on, approach their rulings from a neutral position and evaluate all applicable court filings, Judge Jackson's methodology says nothing about the way she understands and subsequently interprets the law.

In my mind, there are three areas of the law a judge must evaluate: the meaning of the Constitution, statutes, and case precedents. Different theories of interpretation sometimes lead to different answers about the meaning of each of these different areas, which is why it is vitally important to know what a Supreme Court nominee's philosophy is.

For example, Justice Breyer, whom Judge Jackson clerked for and is nominated to replace on the Court, often described his own judicial philosophy as pragmatic. As a result, Justice Breyer balances the interests and values surrounding a case.

While I don't agree with Justice Breyer's method of interpretation, Judge Jackson won't even commit to abiding by this judicial philosophy, and this is very troubling. If a Justice's legal interpretation has no philosophical grounding, that provides flexibility for a Justice to bend their thinking to achieve a desired outcome instead of following a structured analysis. We have enough politicians in the legislative branch; we don't need any in the courts, especially the Supreme Court.

My concerns with Judge Jackson's apparent lack of a judicial philosophy are magnified by her other progressive and activist choices. Case in point: her

lax stance on the sentencing of pedophiles. The laws she applied simply hold those who distribute child pornography accountable, considering how often these offenders recidivate. Instead, Judge Jackson went out of her way to articulate her discomfort with imposing sentences based upon, in her words, "outdated laws" because the nature of child pornography distribution has changed. For the children depicted in these heinous images, it really doesn't matter how they are distributed. Judge Jackson afforded leniency to offenders and previewed for all of us how she applies outdated laws to modern problems.

Going further, when asked if she supports expanding the number of Justices on the Supreme Court, Judge Jackson refused to reject that position. Perhaps echoing this thought process during the Senate Judiciary hearing, Judge Jackson commented that she would be "thrilled to be one of however many" Justices. This tells me everything I need to know.

In addition, Judge Jackson's unverified stance on life issues gives me great pause. During several exchanges at the hearing, Judge Jackson refused to acknowledge when the life of an unborn child begins. As a result, the only information I have to evaluate is her previous decision supporting a Massachusetts law that created a buffer zone preventing pro-life sidewalk counselors from approaching expectant mothers outside of abortion clinics.

Without an articulated process on how the judge would approach a life question in combination with this troubling decision, I have no reassurance that the judge will not take an activist stance. I cannot and will not accept this answer.

Finally, I am deeply concerned at Judge Jackson's response when asked to define a woman. The judge responded that she is not a biologist. Well, folks, I am not a biologist either, but it seems pretty common sense to me. I can tell you the voters of Iowa didn't have to think about the answer to this question when they elected me as the first woman to represent Iowa in the U.S. Senate. I can tell you the Taliban didn't have to think about the answer to this question when they closed the doors of schools to female students 2 weeks ago. And I can tell you President Biden didn't have to think about the answer to this question when he nominated Judge Jackson as the first Black woman to the Supreme Court.

While I am grateful Judge Jackson believes science is the basis for determining a woman, I am deeply concerned that a fellow woman who is set to define the contours of laws that are specific to women has to even think about an answer to that question.

So Judge Jackson's language, or lack thereof, speaks volumes for me, and I cannot support her nomination for a lifetime appointment on our Nation's highest Court.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, later this week, the full Senate will take up and vote on the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Over the last several weeks, the Congress and the country and, indeed, the world have gotten to know Judge Jackson. We have learned about her broad life experience, her exceptional career, her deep love of the law.

Judge Jackson endured a verbal marathon of intense questioning from members of the Judiciary Committee. She endured challenging and sometimes specious lines of questioning from some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but through it all, she shined. She approached every moment of the hearing with grace, with wisdom, and with brilliance. Her good judgment and sharp mind were on full display for all to see. She was unshakable; she was inspiring.

If confirmed, she will make history as the first Black woman to sit on the highest Court of the land. With Judge Jackson on the top Bench, we will get one step closer to ensuring that the Supreme Court of the United States looks like the Nation it serves; and with Judge Jackson on the highest Court, we will be even closer to realizing the noble ideal inscribed on the face of the Supreme Court building: "Equal Justice Under Law."

Her confirmation will be a victory for all of America.

My State of Maryland is also proud to have a small connection with Judge Jackson. Not only did she reside in Maryland for a period of time, but her brother served on the Baltimore Police Department for 7 years, and he has also served two tours of duty as a member of the Maryland National Guard. Other members of her family also pursued careers in public service. Two of her uncles were police officers, and her parents were public school teachers.

Like her family members, Ketanji Brown Jackson has taken up the mantle of public service as a public defender, as a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, as a district court judge, and as a Federal circuit court judge.

It is no mystery as to why her nomination has been met with widespread praise. She has been lauded by the Fraternal Order of Police and by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Prominent Republican-appointed judges and lawyers have spoken in favor of her confirmation. The American Bar Association listed her as

"well-qualified" for the position to which she has been nominated—their highest rating.

There is no question in my mind that she will serve our Nation well and with distinction as the newest Justice of the Supreme Court, and I will vote in favor of her confirmation this week, proudly.

I have watched many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle strain to find some justification for voting against Judge Jackson. They know she is highly qualified. They know she is a person of integrity. They know she has the training and judgment required of a Supreme Court Justice.

Last week, one Republican member of the Senate Judiciary Committee called Judge Jackson a "person of exceptionally good character, respected by her peers, and someone who has worked hard to achieve her current position."

Another Republican member of the committee noted that she had "impeccable credentials and a deep knowledge of the law."

You would think these were words leading up to state support for Judge Jackson, but in both of those cases, those Senators have announced their decisions to vote against her. The pattern is the same for too many of our Republican colleagues. They come out and praise Judge Jackson and then announce they are voting against her.

So the question is, Why? What is the reasoning here? And I have been listening carefully.

Many of our colleagues tie their opposition to what they have called her "judicial philosophy." They say Judge Jackson will push her own political ideology at the expense of the law. They say she is going to be an activist instead of a judge. They say she will create "new rights from the Constitution out of whole cloth." In fact, that was a quote from my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas, who took to the floor last week in opposing Judge Jackson's confirmation.

When my friend from Texas made that statement, I happened to be sitting where the Presiding Officer is right now, as I was presiding over the Senate, and I listened very closely to his arguments and others that were made along similar lines. None of the claims that I have heard hold water when you look at the facts because here is what Judge Jackson herself said during her confirmation hearing when asked about judicial restraint:

I am acutely aware that, as a judge in our system, I have limited power, and I am trying in every case to stay in my lane.

This is not just a hollow promise. Judge Jackson has explained to this Senate her clear methodology for ruling on cases to ensure that she stays in her lane. The methodology is simple.

Step 1, start from a position of neutrality.

We have all seen the scales of justice. We want them to be evenly balanced. Everybody who walks into a court should get a fair shot. That is step 1.

Step 2, evaluate all of the facts from various perspectives.

Step 3, apply the law to those facts. That is it. She was clear. That is how she makes decisions. That is how she rules from the bench.

So what about the Constitution itself, that great document? What about this notion that she would be a runaway Justice, "creating new rights from the Constitution out of whole cloth"—to use the language, the expression, of some of my colleagues.

That, too, is just plain wrong.

Here is Judge Jackson again when she said:

I believe that the Constitution is fixed in its meaning. I believe it is appropriate to look at the original intent, original public meaning of the words when one is trying to assess because, again, that is a limitation on my authority to import my own policy.

Judge Jackson understands the boundaries of her authority as a judge. She has stayed within those boundaries for over a decade on the Federal bench.

So enough of the spurious arguments that she is going to be an activist on the Court. Her method is clear; it is fair; it is balanced and honest, and I am confident that her rulings will be clear, fair, balanced, and honest.

Let's not forget this: There are certain rights that most Americans would acknowledge are central to our Nation's traditions and values but that are not specifically and expressly enumerated in the Constitution, not each and every one with its own sentence.

I have a short list here: the right to travel, the right to vote, the right to privacy, the right to marry. None of these rights are explicitly, expressly referenced in the text of the Constitution, but all of them have been derived by a close analysis of the letter and spirit of our Constitution and laws. These are rights we all embrace. These are rights the American people don't want elected officials to be able to take away from them.

Let's not forget that the First Amendment, as written, only protects Americans from Federal action, from congressional action, that would violate their right to freedom of religion, press, speech, and assembly.

Over time, the Court has taken action to protect these rights in the face of all government action, whether Federal or State or local, to make sure that those rights are protected against all government action no matter what its source.

Justices appointed by Presidents of both parties have worked to protect rights Americans hold dear.

President Reagan's appointee Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote the majority opinion in the case of *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which protects the rights of same-sex couples to marry. His fellow Reagan appointee Sandra Day O'Connor joined the majority in the case of *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, which reaffirmed the reproductive liberties guaranteed under *Roe v. Wade*.

Let's be clear: The Supreme Court considers the most challenging ques-

tions in American law. Judge Jackson will have to take on these challenging questions, like her peers on the Court, if she is confirmed; but one thing is crystal clear from her testimony and from the record: She will apply the law based on the facts. She will not be a partisan in a robe. She will be a fair, independent Justice of the Supreme Court, and she is very deserving of that title.

I had the great privilege of meeting with Judge Jackson just yesterday. During our conversation, I was struck, again, by her brilliance, her intelligence, her kindness, and resolve. That came across on television during the hearings, but it was very evident in our one-on-one meeting. I thought about another Supreme Court nominee who broke barriers nearly 55 years ago, a man from Baltimore, MD: Thurgood Marshall. He was the first Black man to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States.

So, during my conversation with Judge Jackson, I invited her to join me in West Baltimore at P.S. 103. This is public school building 103. It is in West Baltimore. It is the school where Thurgood Marshall learned to read and write. It is no longer an active school. The building is in bad condition. Just this year, as part of the omnibus appropriations bill, Senator CARDIN and I were able to secure some Federal funds to help renovate that building and to turn it into a living memorial to Justice Thurgood Marshall and to expand opportunities for people in West Baltimore. So I told Judge Jackson that once she gets settled, it would be a great honor and privilege to bring her, the first Black woman on the Supreme Court, to the place where the first Black man on the Court grew up and went to school.

Justice Thurgood Marshall inspired a generation of leaders and public servants to enter the legal field. Soon, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson will do the same. Young people from all across our country will look at the Supreme Court of the United States and feel more included. Her presence on the Court will be a victory for "we the people."

In 1978, Justice Thurgood Marshall said to a group of university graduates:

This is your democracy. Make it. Protect it. Pass it on.

I am deeply honored to work alongside my colleagues in the Senate to advance that vision, as we all strive to form a more perfect Union. And there is no doubt in my mind—no doubt at all—that elevating Judge Jackson to Justice Jackson will make our Union a little more perfect.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 659, Katherine Vidal,